REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1 – 32 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin, U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0181776 ("Atkin"). Applicants respectfully traverse the pending rejections.

Claim 13 – 32

Claims 13 – 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Atkin does not teach or suggest "an application interface component which prevents an application from handling said user input event by obfuscating said code from said application when one or more of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action," as required by independent claim 25. Similarly, Atkin does not teach or suggest an input manager that is "configured to prevent one or more applications from handling said user input event by obfuscating said code from the one or more applications when said converting means are interested in performing a conversion action," as required by independent claims 13 and 30.

Atkin discloses a system for providing Unicode support in legacy operating systems. Atkin, Abstract. Because legacy operating systems may not be equipped to handle a wide variety of languages, the system of Atkin includes an input method editor (IME) configured to convert an input into its Unicode value. An application that is Unicode capable can then receive the Unicode value corresponding to an input and can make use of the input. As explained by Atkin, "In this way, the operating system is bypassed so that the operating system

need not be equipped with an input method editor in order for Unicode to be used with a Unicode capable application." Atkin, para. 10.

As previously mentioned, independent claims 13, 25 and 30 require preventing "an application from handling said user input event by obfuscating said code from said application when one or more of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action." To teach this claim element, the Office Action relies on Atkin in the case where the target application is not Unicode capable. The Office Action states, "[I]n the case where the application does not support Unicode then an obfuscated version of the input is received by the application." The Office Action explains, "This obfuscated version is simply the non-unicode input."

Providing a non-Unicode input to an application does not teach or suggest the claim elements at issue for at least three different reasons. First, providing an application a non-Unicode input in no way teaches "obfuscating said code from said application." When an active application is not Unicode capable, Atkins takes no action with respect to a keyboard event and simply passes the event on for normal processing. Atkin, para. 37. Figure 6 illustrates this aspect– if the application does not support Unicode, the process ends without any further processing. As explained by Atkin, if the application is not capable of handling Unicode inputs, "**the operation terminates with keyboard events being processed in a normal manner** as if the [input method editor] were not present." Atkin, para. 37 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the providing of the non-Unicode input does not involve any obfuscation of a keyboard input. Rather, Atkin simply processes the input event "in a normal manner." If the claimed "obfuscating" of the code is to have any meaning at all, *it must include some hiding of the*

underlying value. Handling an input event in a normal manner in no way suggests "obfuscating" or hiding the input event's value from an application.

Secondly, providing an application a non-Unicode input in no way teaches preventing "an application from handling said user input event." Atkin teaches a "bypass" in which an input method editor is provided to convert an input event into a Unicode value when a Unicode capable application is to receive the input event. Atkin, para. 31. If the application at issue is not Unicode capable, the bypass of Atkin is not utilized, and the system processes the event "in a normal manner." Atkin, para. 37. Importantly, the system of Atkins takes no action to prevent a non-Unicode capable application from processing the input event. If the application can handle the input event, then such handling will proceed as normal. In short, Atkins, by providing a non-Unicode value, in no way prevents "an application from handling" an event.

Third, the claim elements at issue provide the obfuscated code "when one or more of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action." Atkin, however, provides a *converted Unicode value* when a converting component is interested in performing a conversion action. As explained by Atkin, "If the application 410 is capable of receiving Unicode input, the keyboard hook module 440 forwards the keyboard events to the keystroke conversion module 460." Atkin, para 37. The keystroke conversion module can then convert the keyboard event into its Unicode representation. Atkin, para. 39. Such a *converted Unicode value*, of course, is not an obfuscated code. So, in contrast to the claims, Atkins teaches providing a converted Unicode value when the conversion module is interested in performing a conversion action, not an obfuscated code as required by claims 13, 25 and 30.

For at least these reasons, Atkin fails to teach or suggest preventing "an application from handling said user input event by obfuscating said code from said application

when one or more of said text converting components are interested in performing a conversion action," as required by independent claims 13, 25 and 30. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit independent claims 13, 25 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 14 - 24, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 26 - 29, which depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 30, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Claim 1 – 12

Claims 1 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin. Claim 1 has been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that Atkin does not teach or suggest "notifying an application of said input event by providing said application a sentinel value when the text converting component is interested in performing said conversion action," as required by amended independent claim 1.

Atkin has been previous discussed. In one aspect, Atkin teaches a "bypass" in which a converted Unicode value is communicated to a Unicode capable application. Atkin, para. 31. Alternately, when the active application is not Unicode capable, Atkins does not take any action with respect to a keyboard event and simply passes the event on for normal processing. Atkin, para. 37. In either case, Atkin in no way teaches or suggests utilizing a sentinel value to notify an application of an input event.

In contrast, independent claim 1, as amended, recites "notifying an application of said input event by providing said application a sentinel value when the text converting component is interested in performing said conversion action." Atkin teaches the providing of an unconverted input value or a converted Unicode value in response to an input event. Atkin does not teach notifying an application of an input event by providing a sentinel value. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2- 12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Claims 1 – 32 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547